

INDIANA SUPREME COURT
Division of State Court Administration
Judicial Technology and Automation Committee

**QUESTIONS FROM CLERKS ABOUT THE STATEWIDE CASE
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

Q: Is it true that if and when the new Case Management System comes about, we will be able to use our existing vendor?

A: When the Case Management System is operational, you will/may not need a vendor because the functions will be handled by the state CMS given to counties free of charge. Of course, counties are free to make decisions about other technology needs.

Q: If JTAC is staying with Computer Associates, why are they staying with Computer Associates?

A: Computer Associates (CA) was chosen as the project vendor through a public, competitive bidding process and there is a signed contract. JTAC has been, and will continue to ensure that those contract obligations are met. The choice of CA also included the participation of the Clerks Association. It is true that some of the work did not meet our standards, but we have been assured by the highest levels of CA management that this project is a high priority and they will meet our specifications. Work is very much in progress. Also, while it is small consolation, delays in large technology projects are not unusual.

Q: A lot of Clerks do not support an outside vendor when we have many qualified here in Indiana.

A: This project was awarded, like all state contracts, after a public, competitive bidding process where any vendor can compete. To review the bidders and final decision, you can read the documents online at: <http://www.in.gov/judiciary/jtac/cms/0723.html>

Q: In selecting a new court system will Clerks be a part of the process? Such as, being members of the selection committee.

A: The CMS system vendor was chosen after a competitive bidding process and the final vendor, Computer Associates, was approved by the Clerks Association. The project is moving forward with increased participation from Clerks to ensure their input is being heard. First, JTAC hired former Clerk Deb Arnett as a consultant. Second, the project steering committee now includes two clerks, Tammy Baitz and Lynne Spivak, as members. The CMS will benefit many people – clerks, judges, attorneys, state and federal officials seeking data, and most importantly, the general public who we are all here to serve. Input from those who will use the system is critical to its success.

Q: Will there be a full detail accounting of how and where the money has been spent by JTAC?

A: We have been asked how much the JTAC budget is and how much has been spent to date. This is, of course, public information and is reported to the State Budget Agency and Legislature as part of the Supreme Court's budget.

As to the overall budget, when the Supreme Court authorized the JTAC case management project and the hiring of Computer Associates as the lead vendor effective June 30, 2002, the Court estimated the cost of the project over six years would be between \$73.9 and \$92.3 million. The difference between those two numbers was a function of conservative budgeting. That is, while the hope was that based on everything going perfectly, the project could be completed for \$73 million, change requests, inflation, and other unknowns would likely push the cost up and the Court wanted that likelihood reflected in the budget. (This budget included the cost of PCs and printers for the counties but no other individual county costs.)

JTAC has been in business just about five years; it began operations in July, 2000. Through the end of the last quarter, March 31, 2005, total expenditures for the just-under five-year period totaled \$13.3 million. This amount includes not only the case management system project but also the LEXIS contract, Ivy Tech training, and other JTAC programs.

A summary of the major expenditure categories – again, totals for the just-under five-year period – were:

Computer Associates	\$5,900,000
Salaries and fringe benefits	\$2,900,000
Other consultants	\$1,200,000
Equipment	\$600,000
LEXIS	\$500,000
Database software license	\$500,000
Ivy Tech	\$400,000
Rent	\$300,000

A breakdown of the above numbers in more detail is on the following page.

The following provides additional detail of the above expenses.

JTAC Expenditures		July 1, 2000	
		March 31, 2005	Reference in Answer
Total Equipment		577,811.56	Equipment
Salaries, wages, and fringe benefits		2,930,179.25	Salaries and fringe benefits
Materials and supplies		47,669.97	
Contractual Services			
	CA	3,374,943.43	Computer Associates
	Crowe	527,568.00	Other consultants
	DAI	614,967.00	Other consultants
	LEXIS	462,119.67	LEXIS
	Other	158,397.86	
	Total	5,137,995.96	
Rent		279,359.17	Rent
Software			
	CA	2,542,410.00	Computer Associates
	Oracle	485,848.50	Database software license
	Other	85,688.36	
	Total	3,113,946.86	
Training			
	Ivy Tech	382,811.00	Ivy Tech
	Other	39,585.38	
	Total	422,396.38	
Other		326,782.71	
GRAND TOTAL		12,836,141.86	

Q: I know all the Clerks want to know what happened with all the money they collected for JTAC. Nothing seems to be moving right along. Can you explain what exactly happened and what you will do to alleviate this problem?

A: See previous answer on funds. The project delay occurred because some assumptions did not prove to be accurate. We believed an existing financial application could be modified to serve the needs of Clerks, and that a CMS system up and running in five Florida counties could also be modified for use in Indiana. When the products were modified and were actually tested, we were not satisfied they would serve the unique needs and wishes of CMS users in Indiana and the project came to an immediate halt

until a resolution was reached with our vendor. Today, work on the Indiana CMS is back in high gear.

Q: We have a great accounting system now. Our State Board of Accounts Auditor was just here, and even complimented us on our system. I, for one, don't want to settle for anything less.

A: The financial application is one of the most important parts of the CMS. We will not accept something that does not meet standards. Clerks' input on this part of the system is critical. Clerks have been added to the steering committee and JTAC has hired a former clerk as a consultant to this project.

Q: I think the county Clerks need to be in on a lot of the problem-solving and input on JTAC.

A: We agree. That is why JTAC hired a former clerk as a consultant and added two elected clerks to the project steering committee. Clerks have been and will continue to be involved in setting the detail and scope of the project requirements. In addition, you can send us your questions, comments or suggestions at any time.

Q: Would JTAC consider just setting standards of court systems and allowing counties to purchase their own systems meeting JTAC standards?

A: There are two issues counties who wish to "go it alone" should consider. First, the CMS will be available to you basically at no cost – something quite significant in light of tight local budgets. Second, the basic premise of the CMS is that it will connect counties with each other and state agencies. Current cms systems, except for a juvenile system, cannot exchange information with courts outside that county.

Q: I believe that instead of this money going to the state, they should give it to the county Clerks so that they can establish their own court system.

A: The main goal of the CMS system is not just to capture information from courts and clerks electronically, but to have counties connected with each other and with state agencies. For example, if the BMV needed data on a certain type of conviction they could check the CMS once, not 92 separate systems. Or, if tracking of protective orders was needed to identify batterers, only the CMS could give a statewide total.

Q: I am somewhat concerned about the impact online access. We currently charge customers for copies of court records and that helps our county's budget. Public access to those records will cost the county by losing the copy fee revenue. Has anyone addressed this concern?

A: Having records available online is a public service for all Hoosiers. It saves them time and money. Because counties are generally making do with very small staffs, it could be a benefit to free up an employee from having to make photocopies so their time is used

for a more critical task that would benefit the county. Also, the amount charged for copies is limited under the Public Access Law.

Q: I heard from someone the other day from the State Court Administration that stated by Sept. 30, 2005 we will have to send the SR-16 electronically, which we do not have that capacity now as we have not had any upgrades.

A: The federal government is requiring that certain CDL convictions be reported to the BMV within 10 days, or the state risks losing up to \$30 million in federal highway funds. JTAC is already working with counties to develop a solution to assist them in meeting the deadline. JTAC has partnered with the BMV to get a federal grant to help counties fulfill this requirement. JTAC will help counties by either adding a reporting tool to their existing CMS system or giving them a simple web-based reporting system to use. The technology developed to transmit SR-16 forms will also contribute to the final CMS system.